IFW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/826,153 Filing Date ⁄试RANSMITTAL April 16, 2004 First Named Inventor **FORM** Scher Art Unit 1631 **Examiner Name** Russell Negin all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 01-002001 umber of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC ~ Petition Amendment/Reply (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): Return Receipt Postcard Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Nanosys, Inc. Signature Printed name Andrew L. Filler Date Reg. No. B-28-06 44,107 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature Date Typed or printed name august 28, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSIONOR MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria,

VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

, *0* 

Michelle Chan

Appl. No.

10/826,153

Confirmation No. 8584

**Applicant** 

Erik C. Scher et al.

Filed

April 16, 2004

TC/A.U.

1631

Examiner

Russell Negin

Docket No.

01-002001

Customer No.:

33140

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed August 2, 2006, Applicants respectfully elect to prosecute claims in Group II (Claims 26-48) without traverse. With respect to the Examiner's requirement for species elections with respect to claims 27, 30, 32, 33, 36, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 and 48 in Group II, Applicants respectfully traverse. The Examiner has imposed an unreasonable requirement for over 25 species elections for claims in Groups I and II. With respect just to claims in Group II elected by Applicant herein, the Examiner has required 11 species elections alone.

In particular, all the claims in Group II for which the Examiner has required species election are Markush group claims. Under MPEP Section 803.02, if the

Appl. No. App. Amnd dated August 28, 2006 Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2006

members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all claims on the merits, even though they may be directed to independent and distinct inventions. Applicants are of the belief that it would not pose an undue serious burden for the Examiner to perform a reasonably comprehensive search of the species in each of these 11 Markush group claims, and that the corresponding potential increase in cost for the Applicants to file many applications to cover their different species inventions would be unreasonable if no generic claim is found to be allowable.

Applicants believe that most of the claims subject to species restriction in Group II, if not all of the claims, contain species that are sufficiently related in light of the subject matter of the instant claimed invention that a search and examination of the entire claims and all members of the Markush group in the claims arguably can be made without serious burden, even though they may be directed to independent and distinct inventions. For example, dependent claims 32 and 33 are Markush group claims which recite various semiconductor compositions for the claimed nanocrystals. All of the recited compositions are conventional Group III-V, Group II-VI, or Group IV semiconductor materials that are sufficiently related in terms of their light emission characteristics that a search and examination of only one or a few species within each Group can be readily made without undue burden and should be sufficient to illuminate any relevant background art in this area. Accordingly, it is Applicants' position that the Examiner should not require provisional election of a single species in each of claims 27, 30, 32, 33, 36, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 and 48.

However, to the extent that the Examiner maintains his position that species elections are required for each of the claims in Group II as set forth in the Examiner's August 2, 2006 Office Action, in order to expedite prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully elect the following species:

1. Claim 27 – semiconductor nanocrystals

Appl. No. App.
Amnd dated August 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2006

- 2. Claim 30 substituted silane
- 3. Claim 32 InP
- 4. Claim 33 CdSe
- 5. Claim 36 colloidal synthesis
- 6. Claim.40 UV wavelengths
- 7. Claim 42 varying a concentration of a nanocrystal constituent
- 8. Claim 43 intravenous
- 9. Claim 45 varying a size of a nanocrystal
- 10. Claim 46 polymer
- 11. Claim 48 animals

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for early examination, and action toward that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew L. Filler Reg. No. 44,107

NANOSYS, INC. 2625 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304 Tel. (650) 331-2176 Fax (650) 331-2191